

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS

California Rules of Court, rule 8.1115(a), prohibits courts and parties from citing or relying on opinions not certified for publication or ordered published, except as specified by rule 8.1115(b). This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.

IN THE COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

SECOND APPELLATE DISTRICT

DIVISION SIX

In re R.S., a Person Coming Under
the Juvenile Court Law.

2d Juv. No. B295066
(Super. Ct. No. VJ46396)
(Los Angeles County)

THE PEOPLE,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

R.S.,

Defendant and Appellant.

R.S. appeals a judgment entered after the juvenile court sustained two counts of a wardship petition alleging first degree burglary, and grand theft of property exceeding \$950 value. (Welf. & Inst. Code, § 602, subd. (a); Pen. Code, §§ 459, 487, subd. (a).) The court declared R.S. to be a ward of the court and placed him home on probation with terms and conditions.

FACTUAL AND PROCEDURAL HISTORY

On August 14, 2018, the prosecutor filed a Welfare and Institutions Code section 602 petition alleging that R.S. committed residential burglary (count 1) and grand theft of money exceeding \$950 (count 2). (Pen. Code, §§ 459, 487, subd. (a).) Over several days in December 2018, the juvenile court held a contested adjudication hearing.

At the hearing, the prosecutor presented evidence that on June 30, 2018, R.S. and his friend entered the locked bedroom of R.S.'s brother and opened a locked safe therein. The boys took more than \$950 currency from the safe. R.S. later admitted to his brother that he and his friend seized \$8,000 from the safe. R.S.'s brother reported the matter to police officers at the urging of his mother, who stated: "Just call the cops. It's getting out of hand."

Following presentation of evidence and argument by the parties, the juvenile court sustained both counts of the wardship petition. At the disposition hearing, the court declared R.S. a ward of the court pursuant to Welfare and Institutions Code section 602, and ordered him placed home on probation with terms and conditions.

We appointed counsel to represent R.S. in this appeal. After counsel's examination of the record, she filed an opening brief raising no issues.

On May 15, 2019, we advised R.S. that he had 30 days within which to personally submit any contentions or issues that he wished to raise on appeal. We have not received a response.

We have reviewed the entire record and are satisfied that R.S.'s attorney has fully complied with her responsibilities and that no arguable issue exists. (*People v. Wende* (1979) 25 Cal.3d

436, 441; *In re Kevin S.* (2003) 113 Cal.App.4th 97, 119
[prophylactic rules of *Wende* apply to delinquency appeals].)

The judgment is affirmed.

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED.

GILBERT, P. J.

We concur:

YEGAN, J.

PERREN, J.

Nancy Newman, Judge

Superior Court County of Los Angeles

Courtney M. Selan, under appointment by the Court of
Appeal, for Defendant and Appellant.

No appearance for Plaintiff and Respondent.